

\*E-FILED January 19, 2012\*

RODGER R. COLE (CSB No. 178865)  
[rcole@fenwick.com](mailto:rcole@fenwick.com)  
 MOLLY R. MELCHER (CSB No. 272950)  
[mmelcher@fenwick.com](mailto:mmelcher@fenwick.com)  
 FENWICK & WEST LLP  
 Silicon Valley Center  
 801 California Street  
 Mountain View, CA 94041  
 Telephone: 650.988.8500  
 Facsimile: 650.938.5200

TYLER G. NEWBY (CSB No. 205790)  
[tnewby@fenwick.com](mailto:tnewby@fenwick.com)  
 JENNIFER J. JOHNSON (CSB No. 252897)  
[jjjohnson@fenwick.com](mailto:jjjohnson@fenwick.com)  
 555 California Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
 San Francisco, CA 94104  
 Telephone: 415.875.2300  
 Facsimile: 415.281.1350

Attorneys for Defendant  
 Carrier IQ, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADAM SCHWARTZ, individually and on behalf  
 of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CARRIER IQ, a Delaware corporation,

Defendant.

Case No.: CV-11-06280

**STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE  
 OF TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO  
 RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND  
~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER EXTENDING  
 TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT**

WHEREAS the above-referenced plaintiffs filed the above-captioned case;

WHEREAS the above-referenced plaintiffs allege violations of the Federal Wiretap Act  
 and other laws by the defendants in this case;

WHEREAS over 50 other complaints have been filed to-date in federal district courts  
 throughout the United States by plaintiffs purporting to bring class actions on behalf of cellular

STIP RE CONTINUANCE OF TIME FOR  
 DEF. TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT

CV-11-06280

1 telephone and other device users on whose devices software made by defendant Carrier IQ, Inc. is  
2 or has been embedded (collectively, including the above-captioned matter, the “CIQ cases”);

3 WHEREAS, a motion is pending before the Judicial Panel on Multidistrict Litigation to  
4 transfer the CIQ cases to this jurisdiction for coordinated and consolidated pretrial proceedings  
5 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Sec. 1407, responses to the motion supporting coordination or  
6 consolidation have been filed, and plaintiffs and defendants anticipate that additional responses  
7 will be filed;

8 WHEREAS plaintiffs anticipate the possibility of one or more consolidated amended  
9 complaints in the CIQ cases;

10 WHEREAS plaintiffs and defendant Carrier IQ have agreed that an orderly schedule for  
11 any response to the pleadings in the CIQ cases would be more efficient for the parties and for the  
12 Court;

13 WHEREAS plaintiffs agree that the deadline for defendant Carrier IQ to answer, move, or  
14 otherwise respond to their complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: (1)  
15 forty-five days after the filing of a consolidated amended complaint in the CIQ cases; or (2) forty-  
16 five days after plaintiffs provide written notice to defendants that plaintiffs do not intend to file a  
17 consolidated amended complaint; or (3) as otherwise ordered by this Court or the MDL transferee  
18 court; *provided*, however, that in the event that Carrier IQ should agree to an earlier response date  
19 in any of these cases, Carrier IQ will respond to the complaint in the above-captioned action on  
20 that earlier date;

21 WHEREAS plaintiffs further agree that this extension is available, without further  
22 stipulation with counsel for plaintiffs, to all named defendants who notify plaintiffs in writing of  
23 their intention to join this Stipulation;

24 WHEREAS this Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by Carrier IQ of any defense,  
25 including but not limited to the defenses of lack of personal jurisdiction, subject matter  
26 jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process or service of process;

27 WHEREAS, with respect to any defendant joining the Stipulation, this Stipulation does  
28 not constitute a waiver of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack of

1 personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process, or  
2 service of process; and

3 WHEREAS, plaintiffs and defendant Carrier IQ, as well as any defendant joining this  
4 Stipulation, agree that preservation of evidence in the CIQ cases is vital, that defendants have  
5 received litigation hold letters, that they are complying with and will continue to comply with all  
6 of their evidence preservation obligations under governing law, and that that the delay brought  
7 about by this Stipulation should not result in the loss of any evidence,

8 Now, therefore, pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-12, plaintiffs in the above-referenced case  
9 and defendant Carrier IQ, by and through their respective counsel of record, hereby stipulate as  
10 follows:

11 1. The deadline for Carrier IQ to answer, move, or otherwise respond to plaintiffs'  
12 complaint shall be extended until the earliest of the following dates: forty-five days after the filing  
13 of a consolidated amended complaint in these cases; or forty-five days after plaintiffs provide  
14 written notice to defendant Carrier IQ that plaintiffs do not intend to file a Consolidated Amended  
15 Complaint; or as otherwise ordered by this Court or the MDL transferee court; *provided*,  
16 however, that in the event that Carrier IQ should agree to an earlier response date in any of these  
17 cases, except by court order, Carrier IQ will respond to the complaint in the above-captioned case  
18 on that earlier date.

19 2. This extension is available, without further stipulation with counsel for plaintiffs,  
20 to all named defendants who notify plaintiffs in writing of their intention to join this Stipulation;

21 3. This Stipulation does not constitute a waiver by Carrier IQ or any other named  
22 defendant joining the Stipulation of any defense, including but not limited to the defenses of lack  
23 of personal jurisdiction, subject matter jurisdiction, improper venue, sufficiency of process, or  
24 service of process.

25 4. As a condition of entry into this Stipulation, defendant Carrier IQ and any other  
26 defendant(s) joining this Stipulation, and the plaintiffs, agree that they are complying with and  
27 will continue to comply with all evidentiary preservation obligations under governing law.  
28

1 IT IS SO STIPULATED.

2 DATED: December 29, 2011

KIESEL BOUCHER LARSON LLP

3 By /s/ Paul R. Kiesel

4 Paul R. Kiesel (119854)  
KIESEL BOUCHER LARSON LLP  
5 8648 Wilshire Boulevard  
6 Beverly Hills, CA 90211  
7 Ph: (310) 854-4444  
8 Fax: (310) 854-0812  
9 [kiesel@kbla.com](mailto:kiesel@kbla.com)

10 HORWITZ, HORWITZ & PARADIS  
11 570 Seventh Avenue, 20<sup>th</sup> Floor  
12 New York, NY 10018  
13 Ph: (212) 986-4500  
14 Fax: (212) 986-4501

*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

FENWICK & WEST LLP

14 By /s/ Tyler G. Newby

15 Tyler G. Newby (CSB No. 205790)  
16 [tnewby@fenwick.com](mailto:tnewby@fenwick.com)  
17 Jennifer J. Johnson (CSB No. 252897)  
18 [jjjohnson@fenwick.com](mailto:jjjohnson@fenwick.com)  
19 555 California Street, 12th Floor  
20 San Francisco, CA 94104  
21 Ph: (415) 875-2300  
22 Fax: (415) 281-1350

23 Rodger R. Cole (CSB NO. 178865)  
24 [rcole@fenwick.com](mailto:rcole@fenwick.com)  
25 Molly R. Melcher (CSB NO. 272950)  
26 [mmelcher@fenwick.com](mailto:mmelcher@fenwick.com)  
27 Silicon Valley Center  
28 801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Ph: 650.988.8500  
Fax: 650.938.5200

*Attorneys for Defendant Carrier IQ, Inc.*

**CERTIFICATION**

I, Tyler G. Newby, am the ECF User whose identification and password are being used to file this **STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER RE: CONTINUANCE OF TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT**. In compliance with General Order 45.X.B, I hereby attest that Paul R. Kiesel has concurred in this filing.

DATED: December 29, 2011

By /s/ Tyler G. Newby  
TYLER G. NEWBY (CSB No. 205790)  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
555 California Street, 12th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Ph: (415) 875-2300  
Fax: (415) 281-1350  
[tnewby@fenwick.com](mailto:tnewby@fenwick.com)

25143/00401/SF/5371768.1

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
MOUNTAIN VIEW

FENWICK & WEST LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
MOUNTAIN VIEW

RODGER R. COLE (CSB No. 178865)  
[rcole@fenwick.com](mailto:rcole@fenwick.com)  
MOLLY R. MELCHER (CSB No. 272950)  
[mmelcher@fenwick.com](mailto:mmelcher@fenwick.com)  
FENWICK & WEST LLP  
Silicon Valley Center  
801 California Street  
Mountain View, CA 94041  
Telephone: 650.988.8500  
Facsimile: 650.938.5200

TYLER G. NEWBY (CSB No. 205790)  
[tnewby@fenwick.com](mailto:tnewby@fenwick.com)  
JENNIFER J. JOHNSON (CSB No. 252897)  
[jjjohnson@fenwick.com](mailto:jjjohnson@fenwick.com)  
555 California Street, 12<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104  
Telephone: 415.875.2300  
Facsimile: 415.281.1350

Attorneys for Defendant  
Carrier IQ, Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

ADAM SCHWARTZ, individually and on behalf  
of all others similarly situated,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CARRIER IQ, a Delaware corporation,


Defendant.

Case No.: CV-11-06280

**~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER GRANTING  
STIPULATION RE CONTINUANCE  
OF TIME FOR DEFENDANT TO  
RESPOND TO COMPLAINT AND  
~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER EXTENDING  
TIME TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT**

Pursuant to stipulation, it is SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 19, 2012

  
Honorable Edward J. Davila Howard R. Lloyd  
United States District Judge  
Magistrate

**~~[PROPOSED]~~ ORDER**

CV-11-06280